

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Svacek (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0163937 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the advisory action, the Examiner asserts that the slots 1 to N are N inputs and the output of X-connect is an output. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion.

In the final office action dated 02/04/2008, the Examiner asserted that each module among the N modules of Svacek is analogous to the N-selected-one device of claim 6. In traversal to the Examiner's assertion, Applicant pointed out, in the paper filed 04/09/2008, that the N-selected-one devices of claim 6 perform dynamic allocation of the bandwidth to the N slots; in contrast, the modules of Svacek are placed in the slots (28,30) and receive allocated bandwidth (Svacek, paragraph [0025]), rather than allocate bandwidth for other modules. Further, Applicant also pointed out, in the paper filed 04/09/2008, that the N-selected-one device of claim 6 has N inputs and an output and each of the N inputs can be selected to be in communication with the output, while the module of Svacek at best appears to be merely a module inserted in the slot without any information concerning its input or output being disclosed.

Now the Examiner asserts, in the advisory action, that the slots 1 to N are N inputs and the output of X-connect is an output. In other words, the Examiner now considers the N slots and X-connect (34) as a whole analogous to the claimed N-selected-one device.

Assuming arguendo that the N slots and the X-connect (34) of Svacek can be analogues to one claimed N-selected-one device, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 calls for B/ Δ B pieces of N-selected-one devices and Svacek fails to anticipate these limitations. Svacek at best appears to disclose only one X-connect (34). Svacek, Fig. 3. Thus, connection relationships between the B/ Δ B pieces of N-selected-one devices and the slots differ from the connection relationships between the X-connect 34 with the slots of Svacek.

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the advisory action, the Examiner also asserts that the claims do not have the language of functional details regarding the directly or indirectly connection between the main control module and the slots. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s assertion.

Applicant respectfully submits that from the wording of claim 6 it is clear and definite that the connection between the main control module and the slots is indirect. Specifically, claim 6 recites that “N inputs of each N-selected-one device communicate with the N slots respectively, an output of each N-selected-one device communicates with the main switch module....” Based on this, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the N-selected-one devices communicate between the main control module and the N slots. Therefore, the connection between the main control module and the slots is indirect.

Further, Applicant submits that Svacek fails to anticipate the above limitations. Svacek at best appears to disclose that the X-connect (34), the controller (42), and the microprocessor (44), which are allegedly analogous to the main control module of claim 6 by the Examiner, are directly connected with the slots.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-8 define over the art cited by the Examiner for at least the foregoing reasons. Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, and claim 9 define over the art cited by the Examiner for one or more of the reasons set forth regarding claim 6.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm